

The siege of Budapest . . . one of the War's bloodiest struggles . . . began in December 1944 and turned the entire city into a battleground. Under the Allies' bombs the City was starving to death . . . living in cellars and praying for the Russians to arrive. The Nazis now rounded up 60,000 Jews who were not sheltered in Wallenberg's safe houses and forced them into a ghetto in the heart of Pest . . . living under conditions of far greater misery than anyone else in the hellish city.

Wallenberg, who always put things in writing (he had post War justice in mind), drew up sort of a contract guaranteeing the safety of the Jews in the ghetto and got an SS General to sign it. When the Arrow Cross men came to start the slaughter, the General blocked their way. Wallenberg had persuaded him that he would personally charge him with genocide before the War Crimes Tribunal that Churchill and Roosevelt had avowed would be convened after the war.

Early in January, the starving, ravaged city was at last "liberated". The Russians looted, pillaged and raped their way across the city . . . unleashing a new brand of terror. Everywhere the Russian soldiers turned there were reminders of the Swede. Who was this one man rescue squad? The fact that more Jews had survived the Hungarian Holocaust than any other was largely the result of his courage. His passports were scattered throughout the city, stories of his exploits were told by survivors.

The Russians came with their own plans for the city and the country. They were not just passing through . . . they were going to construct a Communist State, ruled by a single party, controlled by Moscow . . . it was the end of even the modicum of freedom the Hungarians had known before the War. But that was all carefully kept from the exhausted people . . . including Raoul Wallenberg. He should have at this point stayed underground—hidden like his fellow diplomats until the situation calmed down. But that was not Wallenberg's way. He had survived six months of savage Nazi brutality. He had begun to believe in his own immortality. He had plans for rebuilding the Jewish community of Budapest. He could not now abandon the people he had just saved.

So, in a supreme act of courage and recklessness, Wallenberg went looking for the Russian High Command. He found them . . . and at that point his good fortune ran out. His reward for saving up to one hundred thousand lives was not the warm homecoming he had dreamed of. In January 1945 Wallenberg began his long journey into the Soviet Gulag. He never returned.

His precise odyssey is a subject to some speculation and some dispute. Some things regarding his fate are indisputable. He was taken to the Lubyanka . . . the dreaded hell hole that is the KGB's headquarters in Moscow. Wallenberg was accused of being a spy . . . the catchall crime in the paranoid Stalinist state. The Soviets claimed he died of a heart attack two years later. But they never produced a body or a death certificate . . . In my research I interviewed former Gulag inmates who swore Wallenberg was alive through the Fifties, Sixties and even Seventies. The trail has gone cold in the last decade . . . and no one can wish this man such a long ordeal at the hands of his captors.

The injustice of this story is almost too much to bear . . . For Raoul Wallenberg had stood up to the two greatest evils of our Century . . . the Nazis and the Communists. He proved that one man acting fearlessly and with great imagination could make the brutes back off.

In a way, Wallenberg's story is a terrible reminder of the world's cowardice. How many people, how many countries, pleaded that there was nothing to be done. Hitler had power and numbers on his side. Wallenberg made liars of them all.

After the last few years of intimate contact with the savage ethnic wars of the Balkans . . . from Bosnia to Kosovo . . . to Rwanda . . . I have seen how quickly demagogues . . . from Hitler to Milosevic . . . can fan the flames of nationalism and hatred among their people . . . turning former neighbors into murderous enemies.

I hear so often in my prosperous, privileged country the question raised, "Why should we get involved in other's problems? Why should we risk our lives to stop genocidal warfare in another country, another continent?" I have a single word answer to those who say, "Let them take care of themselves. There is nothing to be done. It is inevitable." My answer is: Wallenberg.

#### TRIBUTE TO HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBER DOUGLAS H. NECESSARY

#### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 14, 2000*

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to Douglas H. Necessary, on the occasion of his retirement from the House Armed Services Committee staff after more than 15 years. He will be greatly missed by Members and staff alike.

Doug began his public service in the U.S. Army where he distinguished himself over a 20-year career. He rose from the enlisted ranks, received his commission, and was highly decorated during two combat tours in Vietnam as an infantry officer and retired as a lieutenant colonel. While in the Army, Doug also earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Auburn University and a Master of Arts degree from the Florida Institute of Technology.

Doug's accomplishments on the committee are numerous. He came to the House Armed Services Committee in October 1984, bringing skills that were especially useful in the areas of military procurement, acquisition reform, and research and development. Since 1993, Doug has served as the lead staff person responsible for those issues while working for both the full committee and for the Ranking Minority Member. Doug guided two legislative initiatives, the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 and the Clinger/Cohen Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996, that were landmark efforts to modernize and rectify a severely troubled military procurement process. Doug also pioneered efforts, in concert with Chairman Ron Dellums (D-CA), to better develop the Department of Defense's Small and Disadvantaged Business initiatives, particularly the Mentor-Protégé program.

Doug had a profound effect on the procurement of all of the Department of Defense's major weapons programs. At various times, he was the committee's staff person in charge of each of the services procurement programs, before becoming the lead staff with responsi-

bility for all of the Department's programs. Doug became the ultimate expert on complex systems such as Ballistic Missile Defense, Theater Missile Defense, the V-22 Osprey, the B-2 bomber, the C-17, the F/A-18, and many others. His expertise was recognized not only by the Members of the House, but was also highly regarded by senior officials in the Department of Defense. His decisions about hardware programs were frequently guided by the awareness that the programs would result in weapons systems that would have to be used by real people, and he brought that kind of common sense approach to all of the issues he worked.

Doug has always integrated the depth of his factual knowledge with a keen sense of the realities that existed in the political and fiscal environment of the time. His advice allowed Members to understand what was important and what was possible. Because we knew what options existed, we were able to significantly advance our legislative initiatives. His work was always thorough and unbiased, and he had a unique knack for being able to explain complex and arcane subjects to novices and experts alike.

Perhaps the hallmark of Doug's career on the Hill was that he never lost sight of the ultimate goals of good government and sound national security policies. Good stewardship of the taxpayers' dollars and doing what was in America's best interests were always the guiding principles in his work. There is no doubt that the country is better off because of his extraordinary efforts.

I know I speak for countless members and staff when I thank Doug Necessary for his outstanding service to the country, to the House of Representatives, and to the Armed Services Committee. His expertise, his honesty, his friendliness, his availability, and perhaps especially his sense of humor, will be sorely missed. We wish Doug well as he moves on to the next phase of his life, knowing that he will make a difference for the better wherever he goes.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. HILBRICH AND WILLIAM J. BORAH

#### HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 14, 2000*

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, It is with great pride and honor that I commend Mr. John F. Hilbrich and Mr. William J. Borah for their extraordinary service to their Northwest Indiana and Illinois communities. On Wednesday, March 15, 2000, these men will be honored at the 2000 Legal Community Recognition dinner, a benefit for the Calumet Council, Boy Scouts of America. This event, chaired by David E. Wickland, will be held at the Center for Visual and Performing Arts in Munster, IN.

John Francis Hilbrich, a northwest Indiana native, has dedicated his life to serving his community and his country. After completing his undergraduate work cum laude at the University of Notre Dame, he enrolled in their distinguished law program which he successfully completed in 1951. Mr. Hilbrich was admitted

to the bar later that year. He went on to serve in the U.S. Army as a Counter-Intelligence Special Agent from 1951–53. He later became the Lake County Deputy Prosecuting Attorney as well as a member of the Diocesan Council, Roman Catholic Diocese of Gary. Mr. Hilbrich is currently a partner at the Hilbrich, Cunningham, and Schward law firm in Portage, IN.

In addition to his impressive career achievements, John Hilbrich has always used his skills to improve his community. He is a charter member on the Board of Directors for the Lake County Bar Association. Mr. Hilbrich is also a member of the Real Property, Probate, and Trust Law section of the Indiana Bar Association. He is a proud member of the National Diocesan Attorney Association and a Regional Director for Bank One.

William J. Borah was born and raised in Calumet City, IL. In 1971, he graduated with a bachelors degree in history from Christian Brothers University in Memphis, TN. He subsequently attended the University of Saint Louis, where he earned his education administration degree as well as a masters degree in history. He went on to receive his Juris Doctor from the University of Memphis School of Law in 1982.

In addition to owning his own law firm where he performs a multitude of tasks, Mr. Borah has taken an active interest in helping youth. He taught History at St. Louis High School from 1971–76, where he received the Superb Teacher Award. From 1976–79 he served as the Dean of Instruction at Frontier Community College in Fairfield, IL. In addition to carrying a full course schedule during his law school years, Mr. Borah served as a Dorm Director at Christian Brothers University.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending John F. Hilbrich and William J. Borah for their lifetime commitment to service in Northwest Indiana and Illinois, respectively. Our communities have greatly benefited from their selflessness and dedication.

## IMPROVING PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

**HON. TIM ROEMER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an address by the distinguished former Member of the House, Lee Hamilton. I had the honor of serving with Lee for a number of years and he was widely respected as a reasoned and perceptive voice on how to improve the image and public understanding of Congress. The topic of his speech, "Improving Public Trust in Government" is especially timely. I encourage all Members to give it careful consideration and submit it for the RECORD.

IMPROVING PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT  
(By the Honorable Lee H. Hamilton)

### INTRODUCTION

I am honored to be speaking at this John C. Whitehead Forum.

John Whitehead is one of the preeminent public servants of our time. He has been a

friend for many years, and on countless occasions I have had reason to appreciate his constructive, problem-solving approach to national challenges. He will go into my Hall of Fame of distinguished public servants. His accomplishments in the private, public and nonprofit sectors make him a "triple threat" kind of performer. Our nation is deeply indebted to him for his remarkable service.

It is also a pleasure to be here because I have the highest esteem for the work of your Council. Your goal of improving the performance of government is tremendously important. I always think of such efforts as part of the quest for truth and justice. So I commend and encourage you in your good work.

Your partnerships with other organizations and the private sector help build the kind of large base we need to push for positive change in government performance.

I especially want to thank Pat McGinnis for her extraordinary leadership at the Council. She has done a remarkable job advancing the cause of good governance.

Pat has asked me to speak today about trust in government—with a particular emphasis on the Congress.

I approach the task with trepidation. I am only too aware of the low esteem in which the public holds the Congress—we rank only slightly above drug dealers and other felons. Having served in Congress for 34 years, that reputation does not fill me with confidence about my credibility on the topic of trust in government.

My constituents would often tell me just how awful my colleagues and I were. They would say to me fondly:

"You must be a bunch of idiots up there."

"You are irrelevant. Get out of my life."

"I know you have your hands in the till, Hamilton. Come clean!"

"Hell must be full of politicians like you."

Public distrust of government—always present in our history—has been on the rise over the past few decades. In the mid-1960s, three-quarters of Americans said they trusted the federal government to do the right thing most of the time. In the Council's poll this year, that number was down to 29 percent.

This decline in public confidence in government is deeply worrisome to all of us. It signals a great chasm between the government and the people, and makes it all the more difficult for government officials to carry out their responsibilities.

### I. Reasons for public cynicism and distrust

The reasons why Americans are turned off by American politics today are many:

(1) Declining trust generally: Declining trust in government reflects a broader trend in our society of diminished confidence in authority and institutions generally—not just government. Since the 1960s, Americans have become less deferential and more skeptical of authority. Our government's involvement in Vietnam, Watergate, and other scandals contributed to this broad societal change. But many other institutions—including even our churches and synagogues—have suffered a drop in public trust as well.

(2) Changing economy: Even though the American economy has done exceedingly well in recent years, economic anxieties run high for many Americans worried about how to pay for education, health care, and retirement. Workers feel the threats of globalization and technology, and growing income inequality. I have always been impressed how economic pressures bear down on families, in good and bad times. To many people, government seems less relevant and not particularly helpful with their difficult

work transitions and burdensome costs. Many Americans see the government as an obstacle rather than a helping hand to achieving the American dream.

(3) Poor leadership: There is disillusionment with the personal flaws of political leaders. This disillusionment is felt most strongly with respect to the misconduct of some of our presidents, but is also felt towards Members of Congress, cabinet members, and many other public officials. Many Americans believe public officials look out for themselves and pursue their own agendas rather than the interests of the people and the nation.

(4) Money and special interests: Americans feel that money and special interests have excessive influence in politics. Most Americans believe their own representative has traded votes for campaign contributions. They know our system of financing elections degrades politician and donor alike, and arouses deep suspicion of undue, disproportionate influence in exchange for the large contributions.

Special interests often contribute to public distrust of government by portraying government negatively—by using overblown rhetoric to convince people they are being endangered by sinister politicians and corrupt government. These groups excel at making themselves look good and the government look bad.

(5) Negative campaigns: Americans dislike the dirty, negative election campaigns that have become so common. They are turned off by personal attacks, and the view held by many politicians that to win a close race you must tear down your opponent. Americans disapprove of the way politicians attack other politicians' motives and criticize the very institutions they are seeking to join and lead. Candidates run for Congress today by running against Congress and often against government, too. It is really rather easy for a candidate for Congress to go before any audience in America and make himself look frugal, wise and compassionate and the Congress look extravagant, foolish and cold-hearted.

(6) Partisanship: There is a widespread belief that politics has become too partisan, too sharp-edged, too mean-spirited. The messy political process and the constant bickering signal to many Americans that partisan considerations take precedence in Washington over sound policy formulation.

(7) Performance of government: Large numbers of Americans are simply disappointed by the performance of government. They think it spends their money wastefully, is ineffective, or too intrusive. In a survey taken a couple years ago, 42 percent of Americans couldn't name a single important achievement of the federal government over the past 30 years.

(8) Media: The role of the media in politics exacerbates public disdain of government. The media accentuate differences and conflicts between politicians. I can remember many times when I was rejected for a TV talk show because my views were too moderate. The media focus on the personal lives of politicians, on style rather than substance, entertainment over education. Since the 1960s, newspaper and television coverage has become increasingly negative, cynical and adversarial.

So it is not surprising that many people think there is nothing right with our political system at all.

### II. Consequences of skepticism

What are the consequences of this public distrust and skepticism of government?